

certainly lead to an intolerable tyranny in sober practice. Utopia is not the final remedy for the ills of social life. This More himself admits, and his admission distinguishes him from the socialist doctrinaire who imagines that the salvation of humanity consists in the realisation of a certain system of social doctrine. The necessity of constructing a State on logical principles, of carrying out the communistic theory all through, compels him at times to fit himself into the *role* of the visionary rather than the practical statesman. It would none the less be a mistake to infer that the practical statesman was lost in the visionary. The practical instinct lurks, as we have seen, in almost every page. This is the main purport of the book, and we must make considerable allowance for the literary necessities of Utopia as a work of imagination. The author allows himself occasionally a good deal of poetic licence, for Utopia is poetry as well as criticism. But when its form is discounted it retains a precious worth as an earnest of better things for down-trodden humanity.

SOURCES.—Machiavelli, *Il Principe*, edited by L. A. Burd (1891); *Il Principe e Discorsi sopra La Prima Deca di Tito Livio*, with Introduction by Zambelli (1880). (There is an English translation of the "Prince" in Bonn's Library and Morley's Universal Library); Villari, *Niccolo Machiavelli e i suoi Tempi* (1877), English translation by L. Villari (1878-83); Burd, Florence: Machiavelli, in *Cambridge Modern History* (1902). The "Prince," though written in 1513, while Machiavelli was in exile at San Casciano, was not published till 1532, five years after his death. For Sir Thomas More see primarily *Utopia* (translation by Robinson, 1551); Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers* (3rd edition, 1887) i Hutton, *Life of More*; Lupton, *Dean Colet*.